



---

An Old Russian Passage of Dionysius the Areopagite

Author(s): Keetje Rozemund

Source: *The Slavonic and East European Review*, Vol. 46, No. 106 (Jan., 1968), pp. 192-194

Published by: the [Modern Humanities Research Association](#) and [University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4205934>

Accessed: 17/06/2014 00:10

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Modern Humanities Research Association and University College London, School of Slavonic and East European Studies are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Slavonic and East European Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# An Old Russian Passage of Dionysius the Areopagite\*

KEETJE ROZEMUND

IN 1870 publicity was given to the existence of a sixteenth-century manuscript which contained a number of theological epistles. The owner of the manuscript, V. M. Undol'sky (†1864), had attributed all these epistles to the Russian starets Artemy, who had fled to Lithuania in the second half of the sixteenth century.<sup>1</sup>

In 1906 S. G. Vilinsky, following Undol'sky, tried to prove that the epistles in this manuscript (MS Undol'sky, 494), none of which mentions the author in its address, are all by one and the same author, i.e., starets Artemy. Here I shall deal with just one of these arguments, that which attempts to prove that the epistles of MS Undol'sky 494 were all written by the same author.

Vilinsky points out that all the epistles quote Dionysius the Areopagite in support of the religious doctrine proclaimed in them.<sup>2</sup> However, the quoting of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite cannot be taken as evidence of the identity of the author or authors of these epistles. The South-Slavonic translation of the works of pseudo-Dionysius, by Isaiah, a monk of Mount Athos, had already been in existence for nearly two centuries.<sup>3</sup> The oldest Russian copies of it date from the fifteenth century.<sup>4</sup> Prince Andrey Kurbsky, a contemporary and friend of starets Artemy, likewise quotes pseudo-Dionysius many times as an authority in dogmatic matters<sup>5</sup>; and Ivan IV, in his well-known correspondence with Prince Kurbsky, quotes extensively from the Epistle to Demophilus.<sup>6</sup>

The epistles attributed to starets Artemy twice contain an elaborate quotation from the second chapter of the 'Epistle to Demophilus': once in the 'Epistle to the Lutherans', and once in the 'Epistle to an Unknown Prince'. In the 'Epistle to the Lutherans' the order of the sentences in the passage quoted has been changed.

\* This paper was presented to the XIIIth International Congress of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, in September 1966. I am grateful to the Netherlands Organisation for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.) for granting me a fellowship for the Congress.

<sup>1</sup> Slavyano-russkiya rukopisi V. M. Undol'skago, Moskovskiy publichnyy Rumyantsevskiy muzey, Moscow, 1870, cols. 363–70.

<sup>2</sup> S. G. Vilinsky, *Poslaniya Startsa Artemiya (XVI vek)*, Odessa, 1906, p. 286.

<sup>3</sup> A. I. Sobolevsky, *Perevodnaya literatura Moskovskoy Rusi XIV–XVII vekov*, St Petersburg, 1903, p. 8, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Sobolevsky, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

<sup>5</sup> *Sochineniya Knyazya Kurbskago*, vol. 1, *Russkaya istoricheskaya Biblioteka*, Vol. XXXI, St Petersburg, 1914, ukazatel', col. 576, Dionisiy Areopagit.

<sup>6</sup> *The Correspondence between Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia, 1564–1579*, ed. by J. L. I. Fennell, Cambridge, 1955, pp. 142–7, 158–73.

The text quoted in the 'Epistle to an Unknown Prince' is closer to the Greek original, and shorter than that in the 'Epistle to the Lutherans'. A comparison of the text in the above-mentioned epistles with that of Ivan IV shows, by the large number of variants, that the Old Russian translation was with only great difficulty understood by both readers and copyists.

I shall now give as much as is available of this text from the 'Epistle to the Unknown Prince' (*K*), drawing the remainder from the 'Epistle to the Lutherans' (*Lutherans*). Thanks to the discovery by the Soviet historian A. A. Zimin, who did considerable research in the manuscript department of the state Public Library in Leningrad (GPB),<sup>7</sup> a second manuscript of the 'Epistle to the Lutherans' has come to light, viz. GPB O XVII 71., fol. 152 v. et seq.<sup>8</sup> I prefer following this latter manuscript for the *Lutherans* passage concerned. In notes I shall give variants in *Lutherans* and in the 'Epistle' of Ivan IV (*Ivan*), in so far as they may amend the text as a result of a comparison with the Greek original. In conclusion I shall discuss the most important emendations in the 'Epistle' of Ivan IV which the text following here allows us to suggest. This text reads:

Что оубо, глаголешъ, не подобаеъ ли с(ва)щенники нече (G.P.B. O XVII 71, 221 r.) ствѣющаѧ, или ѿ иномъ нѣкоемъ безмѣстномъ ѡбличати<sup>a</sup>, и повинны творити? Единемъ же лѣтъ есть хвалащимсѧ в законѣ и престѣпаниемъ того Б(о)га безчестѧщимъ<sup>b</sup>? И како с(ва)щенники изъявителие б(о)жие? (*ibid* 221v.) Какоже востити<sup>c</sup> имоуть людемъ б(о)ж(е)ственыѧ добротѣтели<sup>d</sup>, не ѡвѣдѣвше тѣхъ силу? Или како просвѣтѧтъ помраченіи? Или како б(о)ж(е)стvenaго преподадѧтъ Д(8)ха, іже ниже аще есть Д(8)хъ С(ва)тъ им'ствомъ і истиною вѣровавшей? Азъ же ѡтвѣщаю к симъ: "Аще с(ва)щенникъ оудобрение есть просвѣщател'ное, весма ѡтъпаль есть с(ва)щен'ничьскаго чина же и силы іже не просвѣщателень, і непшоуѧ Б(ог)оу невѣдѣти, наже тѣи собою разоумѣл' есть, и прелѣстити мнѣти іже л'жеименнѣ ѡтъ того ѡтыца нарицаемаго, и смѣять сквернаваѧ своѧ злохоуленіѧ (не бо имамъ реши м(о)л(и)твы) на б(о)ж(е)ственыхъ знаменіѧхъ хр(и)стовиднѣ глаголати. Нѣсть сѣи с(ва)щенникъ, нѣсть, но злыи л'стець и пороугатель собѣ, і волкъ на божіѧ люди ѡболчень в' кожоу." (Undol'sky, 494; GPB., 119r.) Но не инокъ сѣа праведно исправлѧти. (GPB., 221 r.)

<sup>a</sup> *Ivan*, обличаеми. <sup>b</sup> *Ivan*, обезчествовати. <sup>c</sup> *Lutherans*, *Ivan*, возвѣстити. <sup>d</sup> *Lutherans*, *Ivan*, добродѣтели.

<sup>7</sup> R. B. Zaborova, I. A. Konopleva, N. N. Rozov, 'Materialy po istorii russkoy literatury v rukopisnykh fondakh G. P. B.' (*Trudy Gosudarstvennoy publichnoy biblioteki im. M. E. Saltykova-Shchedrina*, XII, 15, Leningrad, 1964, p. 163, n. 3).

<sup>8</sup> A. A. Zimin, *I. S. Peresvetov i yego sovremenniki*, Moscow, 1958, p. 163, n. 1 (n.b. the misprint of Q XVII for O XVII).

Better readings of this text, as compared with that of Ivan, are the following:

1) The mysterious зло in *Ivan* as a translation of ἀσεβοῦντας must, on the strength of the text published here, be a corruption of злочествѹющая.

2) The Greek τοῖς καυχωμένοις is translated хвалащима (Ivan, хвалящися).

3) Greek τὰς θείας ἀρετάς becomes божественѹа добродѣтели (not Ivan божественое).

4) имѣствомъ i истиною, a translation of εἴξει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ, has been corrupted in *Ivan* into и строим истинною. Имство was a difficult word, as appears from a seventeenth-century Dionysius manuscript, where it has been included among a list of words needing an explanation.<sup>9</sup>

5) светма in *Ivan* must be весма, as was already assumed by J. L. I. Fennell, the editor of the 'Epistle' of Ivan.<sup>10</sup>

6) The verb вѣдѣти has incorrectly become видѣти in *Ivan*.

7) καὶ τολμᾷ has been translated as и смѣть. By an error the *Ivan* manuscripts corrupted this into имеет.

8) δυσφημίας becomes злохоуленѹа in translation, and not зло и хуления (*Ivan*).

9) ἐμὲν becomes праведно, not праведныя (*Ivan*).

In 1878 the so-called Epistles of starets Artemy were published in the *Russkaya Istoricheskaya Biblioteka*.<sup>11</sup> This edition, however, is very unsatisfactory, partly because very few of the numerous biblical and patristic quotations in the texts were recognised as such and identified by the editors. Though Vilinsky identified some of the patristic sources more carefully, his work is also very imperfect. The small passage which we have discussed here may show how greatly a new edition of these epistles may enrich our knowledge of the texts translated into Old Russian, and of the use made of them in the sixteenth century.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> *Opisaniye slavyanskikh rukopisey Moskovskoy Sinodal'noy Biblioteki*, II, 2, p. 5, No. 107, 412v.

<sup>10</sup> *The Correspondence between Prince A. M. Kurbsky and Tsar Ivan IV of Russia*, p. 166, n. 1.

<sup>11</sup> *Russkaya Istoricheskaya Biblioteka*, Vol IV, St Petersburg, 1878, *Pamyatniki polemicheskoy literatury v Zapadnoy Rusi*, book 1, *Poslaniya Startsa Artemiya, XVI veka*, col. 1201-1448.

<sup>12</sup> Compare *ibid.*, col. 1237-1238, 1344-1345.